心理科学进展　2019, Vol. 27, No. 3, 533–543
Advances in Psychological Science　DOI: 10.3724/SP.J.1042.2019.00533

人格判断的线索及其有效性*

吴　婷　郑　涌
(西南大学心理学部, 重庆 400715)

摘　要　透镜模型强调线索的有效性是人格判断准确的重要条件。已有研究表明, 文字信息, 语音内容, 面孔图片, 反映不同情境的视频片段以及面对面交流涉及的言语、非言语信息在人格判断过程中发挥着重要作用。另一方面, 网络背景下常规的文字、视频信息等同样能够有效反映个体的人格特质, 而与人格特质密切相关的网络语言、表情的使用, 状态更新与点赞等特殊线索的有效性也值得深入探究。未来对人格判断线索的研究应加强现实生活情境以提高研究的生态效度, 考虑不同线索间的相互比较以考察线索有效性的适用条件, 深入探究网络情境中个体行为线索的有效性。

关键词　人格判断; 线索; 有效性; 准确性; 网络情境
分类号　B848

初识一个人, 你很可能会依据他的穿着打扮、言谈举止等判断这个人是否外向、是否待人和善等。实际上, 人格判断(personality judgment)的线索无处不在, 人格判断的过程也时刻在发生, 准确的人格判断对个体的心理健康、人际关系等具有积极影响(Decuyper, Bolle, & Fruyt, 2012; Human & Biesanz, 2013; Letzring, 2015; Mayer, Phillips, & Barry, 2015)。然而, 各类信息中, 哪些是反映人格特质的有效线索？这些线索的有效性又受哪些因素影响？以及随着信息技术的不断发展, 网络背景下反映人格特质的有效线索又有哪些？从多种信息中探索人格判断的有效线索不仅具有人格心理学理论价值, 也具有社会实践及临床意义。

1　人格判断的准确性与线索的有效性

1.1　人格判断准确性的衡量指标

人格判断强调准确性, 准确性即个体依据线索对目标人格特质的描述与其真实人格特质的相符程度(Funder, 1999; Funder & West, 1993)。一般认为, 人格判断的准确性有三个衡量指标, 即自我−他人一致性(self-other agreement); 他人−他人一致性(consensus)以及行为预测(behavioral prediction)。自我−他人一致性是指判断者对目标人格特质的描述与目标自我描述的一致性程度(Funder & West, 1993; Kenny, 1994); 他人−他人一致性是指两个及以上的个体对同一目标人格特质描述的一致性程度(Funder & West, 1993; Funder, 2012); 行为预测是指个体对目标人格特质的判断在某种意义上能够预测目标的行为或与行为相关的生活事件(Funder, 2012)。以往研究指出, 行为预测更能反映人格判断的准确性, 但测量较为困难(Blackman & Funder, 1998; Funder, 2012; Gifford, 1994; Kenny, 1991), 因此, 自我−他人一致性与他人−他人一致性目前是人格判断领域的主要衡量指标。

1.2　透镜模型(lens model)

透镜模型指出, 人格判断准确的前提为线索的有效性, 即环境中的线索与人格特质的关联程度(Hirschmüller, Egloff, Nestler, & Back, 2013; Nestler & Back, 2013), 因此, 人格判断的准确性越高意味着线索的有效性越高。

Brunswik 将透镜模型应用于人格判断, 该模型假定, 人类以潜在且间接的方式关注并利用环境中可感知的线索以推断他人的人格特质, 这种

收稿日期: 2018-02-28
* 教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地重大项目(15JJDZONGHE022)。
通信作者: 郑涌, E-mail: zhengy@swu.edu.cn

环境中的线索可视为反映个体人格特质的透镜(Brunswik, 1956; Nestler & Back, 2013)。透镜模型强调，准确判断的过程需要目标展现出与特质相关的线索且能够被知觉者观察到，知觉者进而利用该线索对目标做出判断。这一过程中，线索有效性(cues validity)、线索利用性(cues utilization)以及知觉者的敏感性(sensitivity) (Back & Nestler, 2016; Gangestad, Simpson, Digeronimo, & Biek, 1992; Gifford, 1994; Nestler & Back, 2013)尤为关键。线索有效性指线索与特质的相关程度；线索利用性即知觉者将线索纳入判断过程的程度；知觉者的敏感性越高表明其越能剔除无效线索而依赖有效线索，进而判断也越准确。

透镜模型强调环境中可观察的信号(Nestler & Back, 2013)，那么与个体密切关联的语言文字信息，对话中的语音特点，显而易见的面部、肢体动作变化等非言语信息，与他人交流互动过程中的更多种信息以及网络背景下的各类信息与行为是否能够成为反映人格特质的透镜都是该模型可关注的内容。

2 单一的人格判断线索

2.1 文字信息

语言文字信息是人格判断的线索中形式最为简单的一类。以往研究表明，来自于个体内部与外部的各类文字信息是反映人格特质的有效线索。如个体思维内部高度私密的自然意识流文字可提供判断神经质的信息(Holleran & Mehl, 2008)，基于特定词汇的创造性写作(Küfner, Back, Nestler, & Egloff, 2010)是反映开放性与宜人性的有效指标。Dunlop, Mccoy 和 Staben (2017)的研究显示，依据完整的个人目标清单或某单个目标所做出的人格判断能够达到显著的自评−他评一致。而与个人生活领域有关的兴趣爱好、学业学习、未来计划、朋友、家庭等外部文字内容是反映开放性水平的有效线索(Borkenau, Mosch, Tandler, & Wolf, 2016)。Burusic 和 Ribar (2014)也强调，文字信息对于不同特质具有重要的诊断作用。

2.2 语音信息

语音信息可借助电子激活记录器(Electronically Activated Recorder)收集，由于使用者不能知晓它何时被激活，因此，它可记录个体较为自然的语音内容(Holtzman, Vazire, & Mehl, 2010; Manson & Robbins, 2017)。该工具所记录的内容可反映个体的人格特质, Mehl, Gosling 和 Pennebaker (2006)分析该工具所记录的个体两天内的语音事件内容显示，个体用于交谈的时间反映了外倾性水平，誓言类词语的使用与宜人性呈负相关，到课频率与责任心存在高度相关。并且，个体的表现在性别上存在显著差异，如在男性群体中，自言自语是内倾的表现；而在女性群体中，笑声是情绪稳定性的反映指标。重要的是，判断者所拥有的有关人格特质如何在日常生活中体现的内隐理论是非常准确的。Holtzman 等(2010)使用该工具欲描述自恋个体在日常生活中的表现，分析内容显示，自恋个体的确表现出更高的外倾性与更低的宜人性。Beer 和 Vazire (2017)也认为它是收集外倾性与神经质信息的理想方法。

相较于文字信息，语音信息在此基础上增加了嗓音的音调与情绪变化等内容。从嗓音的音调高低角度讲，以往研究表明，低音调嗓音与令人喜欢的人格特质相联系(Tigue, Borak, O'Connor, Schandl, & Feinberg, 2012)，同时这种嗓音也被知觉为更具吸引力(Collins, 2000; Klofstad, Anderson, & Peters, 2012; Mcaleer, Todorov, & Belin, 2014)，更有能力(Klofstad, Anderson, & Nowicki, 2015)，以及更高的支配性(Jones, Feinberg, Debruine, Little, & Vukovic, 2010; Mcaleer et al., 2014; Puts, Gaulin, & Verdolini, 2006; Tsantani, Belin, Paterson, & Mcaleer, 2016)。高低音调、性别与信任之间存在交互关系，如高音调的男性嗓音被认为更值得信任(Tsantani et al., 2016)，而低音调的女性嗓音却被知觉为更值得信任(Klofstad et al., 2012)。另一方面，个体嗓音的紧张度与对神经质的判断显著相关(Hirschmüller, Egloff, Schmukle, Nestler, & Back, 2015)，而嗓音的温暖度与对自尊的知觉存在关联(Hirschmüller, Schmukle, Krause, Back, & Egloff, 2018)。

然而，以往关于语音线索与人格判断的研究大多缺少发声主体的人格自评信息，未来研究可比较自评与他评以及不同判断者间的一致性，以进一步探究语音线索的有效性。

2.3 行为薄片

行为薄片(thin-slice of behavior)可包括面孔图片、行为视频及其他一些非常规线索，这类线索的研究表明个体能够依据完全的甚至是有限的

非言语信息快速且准确地判断目标的人格特质(Ambady, 2010; Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Tackett, Herzhoff, Kushner, & Rule, 2016)。

2.3.1　面孔

Oosterhof 和 Todorov (2008)将面孔评估结构化，指出面孔评估基于相互垂直的两个维度：效价(valence)与支配性(dominance)。效价指他人将面孔知觉为可接近或需要回避，支配性体现面孔主体的身体强壮程度。面孔的效价与支配性可反映个体的信任与支配性水平，如高度信任的面孔是高兴、愉快的，高度支配性的面孔体现了个体的身体强壮。Walker 和 Vetter (2016)的研究指出，面孔评估的信任和支配性与宜人性和外倾性高度重合，随后研究者改变反映在面孔上的人格维度强度，个体对面孔做出的判断也随着维度强度的变化而变化，这种评价在不同年龄、受教育水平、职业以及不同文化的判断者之间表现出一致性。

Penton-voak, Pound, Little 和 Perrett (2006)将人格维度得分高低的两组面孔进行合成，个体可据此准确判断宜人性与外倾性。考虑到生态效度，Sutherland 等(2015)选用 1000 张日常生活中的面孔图片作为评价对象，不同判断者对大五人格特质的判断表现出高度一致。Qiu, Lu, Yang, Qu 和 Zhu (2015)也指出日常的自拍照与人格特质存在高度相关，观察者可据此准确判断目标的开放性水平。

此外，最初依据面孔图片的判断可影响一个月后的面对面交流过程，同时也会影响面对面交流中的人格判断结果(Gunaydin, Selcuk, & Zayas, 2016)。Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch 和 Mendesiedlecki (2015)也指出，当多种信息资源与面孔同时出现时，人们总是错误地假定自己依据的主要线索是面孔。可见，完整的面孔是人格判断中的一类有效线索。

但就更为精细的面部特征而言，Borkenau 等(2009)指出面孔的愉悦程度对外倾性的判断具有重要调节作用，积极情绪的表达(如更高的面孔信任度)可作为外倾性的有效线索，但个体也被知觉为更积极(Petrican, Todorov, & Grady, 2014)。Schneider 和 Carbon (2017)对个体的自拍照进行精细解读，结果发现，观察者可根据右半部面孔准确判断主体的情绪稳定性与健康水平；从左半部面孔判断外倾性信息和与情感相关的内容(Jia & Lindell, 2016; Kramer & Ward, 2011)。自拍照中个体的眼睛越注视着镜头，观察者对其宜人性的评分越高，紧闭的嘴唇与对外倾性的评估负相关，而鸭嘴脸(duckface; 噘嘴自拍)的呈现与对神经质的判断正相关(Guntuku, Qiu, Roy, Lin, & Jakhetiya, 2015)。实际上，人格判断领域中关于面孔具体特征有效性的研究并不多，这可能表明局部的面孔特征并不完全是提供大五人格特质的有效线索，上述研究结果也表明观察者的判断可能会因某些特征的出现而发生偏离。Penton-voak 等(2006)也指出局部面孔特征或许并不能完全启动人格判断的过程，这一过程可能更依赖于整体的面部构型。因此，完整面孔可能才是更为有效的人格判断线索。

2.3.2　视频片段

视频片段的内容可有多种形式，如让目标进行自我介绍(Hirschmüller et al., 2018)；或者由一个人询问一系列关于“去认识你” (“getting-to-know-you”)的问题，个体进行相应回答(Rogers & Biesanz, 2015)；也可以是两人的日常对话记录(Yeagley, Morling, & Nelson, 2007)；更有研究设置 15 种场景(如讲一个笑话、唱一首歌、讲一个有趣的故事等)要求目标逐个演绎(Borkenau, Mauer, Riemann, Spinath, & Angleitner, 2004)。实际上，相较于面孔图片，视频片段不仅包含了个体的言语信息，它同时也包含了诸如面部表情、肢体动作以及外貌特征等非言语信息，同时，它还可能提供了个体在不同情境中是否表现出人格–行为一致的信息。

以自尊为例，无论是关于自我介绍的有声视频(Hirschmüller et al., 2018)还是无声视频(Yeagley et al., 2007)，都能够准确反映个体真实的自尊水平。Hirschmüller 等(2015)的研究表明，观察者依据自我介绍的视频片段可准确判断个体的神经质水平，其中，个体的声音线索、动态的面孔与身体姿态均具有显著的线索有效性。一方面，自我介绍中的言语信息可有效反映个体的人格特质，另一方面，视频中所展现的多种非言语信息也是提供人格特质信息的有效线索。

就不同情境而言，Human, Biesanz, Finseth, Pierce 和 Le (2014)设置了两种情境，让个体对着镜头大声朗读纽约时报标题，接着与一位女性进行交谈并回答一系列个人问题，或让个体独自对

着镜头回答研究者提前设置好的问题。研究指出，适应良好的个体在不同情境中表现出更高的人格−行为一致性，观察者的判断同样表现出较高的一致性。Borkenau 等(2004)让个体参与到 15 种情境中，同样地，个体依旧表现出人格−行为一致性，观察者的判断也表现出跨情境一致性。可见，个体在不同情境中表现出的行为是一种稳定且有效的线索。尽管在不同情境中个体能够表现出人格−行为一致，但是否存在使个体的行为表现与人格特质出现不一致的情境还需深入探究。

2.3.3 其他

此外，个体身上散发出的味道(Sorokowska, 2013; Sorokowska, Sorokowski, & Havlíček, 2016)，喜欢的鞋类风格(Gillath, Bahns, Ge, & Crandall, 2012)，偏爱的音乐类型(Rentfrow & Gosling, 2006)，工作的场所和居住的卧室环境(Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, & Morris, 2002)等都可有效反映个体的人格特质。可见，人格判断的有效线索众多，值得研究者深入探究。

3 面对面交流中的更多线索

循环设计(round-robin design) (Kenny & Albright, 1987; Kenny & Winquist, 2001)常用于研究面对面交流，该设计要求分组成员必须在面对面情境下对彼此的人格特质做出判断。每组成员人数最少为两人，一般为 5~7 人，成员间交流与否，交流内容、时长等视研究目的而定。如 Brown 和 Bernieri (2017)让参与者 5~7 人一组，首先只进行观察便立即对目标的人格特质进行判断；而后研究者将参与者匹配成对并让其在进行 5 分钟交谈后再次做出判断。结果显示，在快速观察条件下，个体仅能够对目标的部分大五人格特质做出准确判断，而在 5 分钟交谈后，所有的人格特质都能够被准确知觉。

面对面交流(face-to-face communication)过程中，个体为让对方获得全面的信息而可能展现出更多线索(Williams, 1977)，因而提高了人格判断的准确性。Gunaydin 等(2016)指出，依据面孔图片对外倾性的判断在面对面交流后所产生的更正最为明显，这可能是由于诸如多话、爱笑等与外倾性相关的行为线索在面对面交流中更易体现。Okdie, Guadagno, Bernieri, Geers 和 Mclarney-Vesotski (2011)比较面对面交流与网络交流背景下的人格判断表明，面对面交流情境中判断的自我−他人一致性更高。Wall, Taylor, Dixon, Conchie 和 Ellis (2013)比较了网络、电话、面对面三种情境，随着背景丰富性的不断增加，观察者对外倾性与神经质判断的准确性不断提高。这可能是由于面对面交流过程中包含了大量社会线索从而促进了个体对他人的评估(Okdie et al., 2011)。

Argyle 和 Dean (1965)提到，亲密度来源于个体间的目光接触、亲近、朝向、交流主题以及其他一些线索，这表明面对面过程中涉及到的言语、非言语交流与个体间的亲密度存在密切相关。恋人或配偶是个体时常面对且进行交流的对象，这一过程个体可获得更多更为有效的线索。以往研究结果也显示，人格判断的准确性在陌生人之间最低，在恋人或配偶间最高(Allik, de Vries, & Realo, 2016; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000)。同时，恋人能够准确知觉对方日常生活中的情绪体验和情绪调节策略的使用(Clark, Von Culin, Clark-Polner, & Lemay, 2016; Eldesouky, English, & Gross, 2016)；相比于父母与朋友，伴侣也能够更为准确地知觉对方的孤独水平(Luhmann, Bohn, Holtmann, Koch, & Eid, 2016)。陈少华(2017)指出，透镜模型亦可用于分析熟人之间的有效线索。对于一些模糊特质(大方的、老练的)，熟人比陌生人更易于与目标的自我判断达成一致(陈少华, 吴颢, 赖庭红, 2013；吴颢, 陈少华, 2014)。因此，亲近他人更有可能获得更多关键且有效的线索，从而提高人格判断的准确性(Vazire, 2010)。

4 网络背景下的线索

据中国互联网络信息中心(CNNIC)报告显示，截至 2017 年 6 月，中国网民规模高达 7.51 亿，互联网普及率为 54.3%。网络背景下人格判断的研究显示，个体对开放性判断的准确性更高(Markey & Wells, 2002; Stopfer, Egloff, Nestler, & Back, 2014; Vazire & Gosling, 2004; Wall et al., 2013)，而现实情境中个体对他人外倾性与责任心判断的准确性更高(Brown & Bernieri, 2017; Wall et al., 2013)，这可能是由于诸如穿衣风格、说话声音大小、随意动作呈现等与个体外倾性与责任心相关程度更高的线索更易在面对面情境中显现(Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Di Domenico, Quitasol,

& Fournier, 2015; Nestler & Back, 2013)。这也提示，网络背景下的人格判断不同于现实情境，探究网络背景下的有效线索并与现实情境做比较具有重要意义。

4.1　常规线索

个体在网络背景下呈现的文字信息可为人格判断提供有效线索，如以脸书主页(Facebook profile)的个人简介内容为线索，观察者可准确判断目标的开放性与责任心，研究进一步揭示对外倾性的判断基于词汇线索，对责任心的判断基于对职业地位的描述(Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, & Kaye, 2016)。同时，个人简介中的兴趣爱好、分组列表、公告栏等文字内容也可有效反映个体的受欢迎需要，与吸引力相关的自尊水平(Stopfer, Egloff, Nestler, & Back, 2014)。此外，在线社交网站(OSNs)简介与撰写的文章(Tskhay & Rule, 2014)，个人网页上的身份宣示(identity claims) (Vazire & Gosling, 2004)，博客内容(Li & Chignell, 2010)，电子邮件内容(Gill, Oberlander, & Austin, 2006)等文字信息都为人格判断提供了有效线索。Wall 等(2013)也强调网络背景下语言线索的重要性，由于缺乏非言语线索，观察者在进行人格判断时都将注意集中于文字信息。可见，深入探究网络背景下文字信息对于人格判断的有效性非常有必要。

随着网络的不断发展，众多社交平台都出现了语音输入、语音聊天等功能，但以往研究并未涉及网络背景下语音信息对于人格判断的有效性等问题，可能对于人格判断而言网络背景下的语音信息与现实非面对面交流中语音信息的有效性并无显著差异，后续研究应对此进行进一步验证。

社交网站——“油管” (YouTube)为众多视频拍摄爱好者提供了展示平台，个体可将不同于实验室特定设置的各类视频片段上传于该网站。Biel 和 Gatica-Perez (2012)的研究显示，依据该网站视频片段的人格判断达到显著的他人一致性，视频中个体表现出的对话活动、声音线索、目光、肢体动作等都与人格特质存在不同程度相关。Teijeiro-Mosquera, Biel, Alba-Castro 和 Gatica-Perez (2015)也表示，视频中面部表情的表达与人格印象的形成显著相关。可见，网络背景下非特定情境的视频片段同样可包含众多有效的言语、非言语线索。

4.2　特有线索

4.2.1　网络语言

网络语言的使用是网络背景下特有的现象，国外有火星文(textspeak)，如“LOL”代表“Laughing Out Loud”，“BRB”指“Be Right Back”等，国内常有层出不穷的网络新词占据搜索引擎排行榜，如，“城会玩” “活久见”等。网络语言的使用可使聊天内容更为轻松愉快，使个体感到更加亲密(Liu, Lin, & Huang, 2013)。Fullwood, Quinn, Chen-Wilson, Chadwick 和 Reynolds (2015)的研究指出，若个体在描述中使用了网络语言，他将被知觉为具有较低的宜人性、开放性与自尊水平，以及较高的情绪稳定性，由于缺少与自评信息的一致性比较，这种判断是否准确有待进一步探究。Scott, Sinclair, Short 和 Bruce (2014)表示，相比于使用拼写错误的语言和火星文的个体，使用正确语言的目标将会被知觉为更有智慧，更有能力，更可能被雇用。并且，网络语言的使用还可用于区分个体自我监控能力的高低(He, Glas, Kosinski, Stillwell, & Veldkamp, 2014)。网络语言的使用与印象形成存在紧密相关，但这种印象是否准确还需深入探究。

4.2.2　网络表情

在网络交流情境中，符号表情(emoticons, 如:-)，一种笑脸)的使用可弥补非面对面交流存在的某些缺陷，增加文字信息的情感基调以促进传递的有效性，使个体能够调整言语以表达当前的情绪状态(Kaye, Wall, & Malone, 2016; Oleszkiewicz et al., 2017; Wall, Kaye, & Malone, 2016; Walther & Addario, 2001)。符号表情的使用与人格特质存在高度相关，如脸书中符号表情的使用与开放性和宜人性正相关(Wall et al., 2016)；宜人性与神经质得分高的个体比得分低的个体使用更多的符号表情(Oleszkiewicz et al., 2017)。Wall 等(2016)的研究显示，不同判断者基于符号表情的使用情况对目标外倾性、开放性、宜人性以及神经质的判断可达到显著一致；同时，对外倾性与开放性的判断也与目标的自我描述显著一致。但该研究中的判断者只有 7 人，多种人格特质达到显著的判断者间一致性并非不可能，后续研究应增加判断者数量，对这类线索的有效性进行进一步验证。

符号表情的进一步发展为表情图标(emojis, 如😌)，近年来，表情图标的使用在全球范围内

盛行(Novak, Smailović, Sluban, & Mozetič, 2015)。Marengo, Giannotta 和 Settanni (2017)让参与者基于 1600 余种表情图标讨论其与人格特质的关系并从中筛选出可代表自己和朋友人格特质的表情图标清单，分析结果显示，个体自我认同的 91 种表情图标中有 36 种分别与情绪稳定性、外倾性以及宜人性相关，如传递消极情感的表情图标(愤怒、悲伤、失望等)与情绪稳定性呈负相关；而传递积极情感的手势或身体姿态则与外倾性呈正相关。可见，不同符号表情与不同人格特质存在不同的相关关系，那么基于不同网络表情使用情况的人格判断将可能成为未来研究热点。

4.2.3　网络状态更新与点赞

众多网络社交平台都包含状态更新(status updates)功能，如国外的脸书，国内的微信朋友圈、微博等。网络状态更新与人格特质存在紧密相关，具体表现为，人格特质可预测网络状态更新(Winter et al., 2014)；相比于内倾个体，外倾个体在脸书墙上更新动态与照片，点击分享，对他人点赞、评论等行为更为频繁(Lee, Ahn, & Kim, 2014)；就内容而言，外倾个体常在脸书上更新自己的日常生活与社会活动，开放性得分高的个体更可能更新与智力主题相关的内容，责任心高的个体较多更新关于子女的内容，低自尊个体更多地更新关于伴侣的信息(Marshall, Lefringhausen, & Ferenczi, 2015)。

点赞(click like)是网络社交平台上常见的另一种行为。Hong, Chen 和 Li (2017)指出，点赞频率与人际慷慨、公我意识正相关。点赞行为可用于准确推测个体的外倾性，性取向，宗教、种族信仰，政治观点等(Kosinski, Stillwell, & Graepel, 2013)。同时，点赞行为可反映个体与伴侣和朋友的人格相似性(Youyou, Schwartz, Stillwell, & Kosinski, 2017)。基于点赞行为的人格判断研究显示，对开放性判断的自我−他人一致性最高(Youyou, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015)。

5　问题与展望

从单一的文字信息，到包含更多种信息的面对面交谈，不同线索、不同情境的相互交织，使个体必须利用各类有效线索才能对他人的人格做出准确判断。综观这一领域，虽然研究者们对人格判断的线索展开了大量研究，但由于线索本身的复杂性，还存在着许多亟需解决的问题。未来的研究方向可集中在以下几个方面。

第一，改进研究设计，提高生态效度。实验室条件下的文字信息、面孔图片或视频片段的确可提供有效的人格判断线索，但现实生活中个体面对的是真实的语言交流，富于表情变化的面孔以及连贯的行为模式，研究的生态效度问题不容小觑，后续研究可采用日记法记录个体的日常生活事件以作为判断人格的文字线索，利用动态变化的面孔材料(GIF 图)以及记录被试日常生活的视频片段等，以现实生活为原材料探究人格判断线索的有效性。

第二，将不同线索、不同情境进行比较。Letzring 和 Human (2014)指出，个体间讨论行为比表现出该行为更能够促进人格判断的准确性，这表明言语信息较行为表现具有更高的有效性。现实情境中，多种线索常同时出现，判断者需权衡比较哪些线索更为有效，因此，有必要将多种线索进行相互比较，如将同一内容处理成文字与语音形式，可探究个体的嗓音特点等在人格判断中的有效性。透镜模型强调将特质考虑进特定的情境(Back & Nestler, 2016)，这提示，不同情境中判断的准确性可能不同，如 Okdie 等(2011)比较面对面交流与网络交流两种情境下人格判断的准确性，结果表明面对面交流情境中判断的自我−他人一致性更高。因此，研究者应考虑不同情境间的比较，如在竞争与合作条件下个体对同一目标的人格判断是否存在差异，何种条件下判断的准确性更高等；当然，研究者也可依据研究目的设置不同情境进行对比。

第三，重视网络背景下的人格判断。一方面，网络在人类生活中的地位愈发重要；另一方面，网络社交平台中，各类网络语言层出不穷，网络表情的使用日渐丰富与多元化，如国内的“表情包”，国外的符号表情(Oleszkiewicz et al., 2017)等，同时，状态更新与点赞等网络行为也广泛流行。以往研究揭示人格特质与网络行为存在紧密相关，因此，探究网络语言、网络表情的使用情况，状态更新与点赞等行为以及这类行为所涉及的内容等对于判断人格的有效性将是一个有意义的切入点。此外，也可将网络情境与现实情境进行比较，如判断者根据个体的网络个人简介进行评价后，与目标进行语音交流或会面并做出二次判断，以

考察判断准确性的变化情况。

第四，探究中国文化背景下的不同线索。以中文材料为线索的人格判断是否与西方研究结果存在差异；东方面孔所提供的信息是否不同于西方面孔；从网络平台角度讲，国外的 Facebook、Twitter、Instagram，国内的微信、QQ、微博、知乎等，不同工具本身可能就存在差异，因而平台上所反映的信息可能也为人格判断提供了不同线索。因此，从中西方差异的角度探究人格判断的有效线索具有重要研究价值。

参考文献

陈少华. (2017). 人格判断的透镜模型分析. *广州大学学报(社会科学版)*, *16*(8), 51–58.

陈少华, 吴颢, 赖庭红. (2013). 人格判断的准确性: 特质特性的作用. *心理科学进展*, *21*(8), 1441–1449.

吴颢, 陈少华. (2014). 特质模糊性对大学生人格判断准确性的影响. *心理学探新*, *34*(6), 542–547.

Allik, J., de Vries, R. E., & Realo, A. (2016). Why are moderators of self-other agreement difficult to establish? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *63*, 72–83.

Ambady, N. (2010). The perils of pondering: Intuition and thin slice judgments. *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*(4), 271–278.

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(3), 431–441.

Argyle, M., & Dean, J. (1965). Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry*, *28*(3), 289–304.

Back, M. D., & Nestler, S. (2016). Accuracy of judging personality. In J. A. Hall, M. Schmid Mast, & T. V. West (Eds.), *The social psychology of perceiving others accurately* (pp. 98–124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beer, A., & Vazire, S. (2017). Evaluating the predictive validity of personality trait judgments using a naturalistic behavioral criterion: A preliminary test of the self-other knowledge asymmetry model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *70*, 107–121.

Biel, J-I., & Gatica-Perez, D. (2012). The YouTube Lens: Crowdsourced personality impressions and audiovisual analysis of vlogs. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, *15*(1), 41–55.

Blackman, M. C., & Funder, D. C. (1998). The effect of information on consensus and accuracy in personality judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*(2), 164–181.

Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1992). Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*(4), 645–657.

Borkenau, P., Mauer, N., Riemann, R., Spinath, F. M., & Angleitner, A. (2004). Thin slices of behavior as cues of personality and intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(4), 599–614.

Borkenau, P., Mosch, A., Tandler, N., & Wolf, A. (2016). Accuracy of judgments of personality based on textual information on major life domains. *Journal of Personality*, *84*(2), 214–224.

Brown, J. A., & Bernieri, F. (2017). Trait perception accuracy and acquaintance within groups: Tracking accuracy development. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(5), 716–728.

Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burusic, J., & Ribar, M. (2014). The moderating role of self-presentation tactics: Judgments of personality traits and self-presentation of others based on a limited amount of information. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *73*, 235–242.

Clark, M. S., Von Culin, K. R., Clark-Polner, E., & Lemay, E. P. (2016). Accuracy and projection in perceptions of partners' recent emotional experiences: Both minds matter. *Emotion*, *17*(2), 196–207.

Collins, S. A. (2000). Men's voices and women's choices. *Animal Behaviour*, *60*(6), 773–780.

Connelly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(6), 1092–1122.

Darbyshire, D., Kirk, C., Wall, H. J., & Kaye, L. K. (2016). Don't judge a (face)book by its cover: Exploring judgement accuracy of others' personality on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *58*, 380–387.

Decuyper, M., Bolle, M. D., & Fruyt, F. D. (2012). Personality similarity, perceptual accuracy, and relationship satisfaction in dating and married couples. *Personal Relationships*, *19*(1), 128–145.

Di Domenico, S. I., Quitasol, M. N., & Fournier, M. A. (2015). Ratings of conscientiousness from physical appearance predict undergraduate academic performance. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *39*(4), 339–353.

Dunlop, W. L., Mccoy, T. P., & Staben, O. (2017). From personal goals disclosed to personality judgments composed: Trait perceptions made on the basis of idiographic goals. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *68*, 82–87.

Eldesouky, L., English, T., & Gross, J. J. (2016). Out of sight, out of mind? Accuracy and bias in emotion regulation trait

judgments. *Journal of Personality*, *85*(4), 543–552.
Fullwood, C., Quinn, S., Chen-Wilson, J., Chadwick, D., & Reynolds, K. (2015). Put on a smiley face: Textspeak and personality perceptions. *Cyberpsychology Behavior & Social Networking*, *18*(3), 147–151.
Funder, D. C. (1999). *Personality judgment: A realistic approach to person perception*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Funder, D. C. (2012). Accurate personality judgment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(3), 177–182.
Funder, D. C., & West, S. G. (1993). Consensus, self-other agreement, and accuracy in personality judgment: An Introduction. *Journal of Personality*, *6*(4)*1*, 457– 476.
Gangestad, S. W., Simpson, J. A., Digeronimo, K., & Biek, M. (1992). Differential accuracy in person perception across traits: Examination of a functional hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*(4), 688–698.
Gifford, R. (1994). A lens-mapping framework for understanding the encoding and decoding of interpersonal dispositions in nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(2), 398–412.
Gill, A. J., Oberlander, J., & Austin, E. (2006). Rating e-mail personality at zero acquaintance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40*(3), 497–507.
Gillath, O., Bahns, A. J., Ge, F., & Crandall, C. S. (2012). Shoes as a source of first impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(4), 423–430.
Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A room with a cue: Personality judgments based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(3), 379–398.
Gunaydin, G., Selcuk, E., & Zayas, V. (2016). Impressions based on a portrait predict, 1-month later, impressions following a live interaction. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(1), 36–44.
Guntuku, S. C., Qiu, L., Roy, S., Lin, W., & Jakhetiya, V. (2015). Do others perceive you as you want them to?:Modeling personality based on selfies. *International Workshop on Affect & Sentiment in Multimedia,* 21–26).
He, Q., Glas, C. A. W., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D. J., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2014). Predicting self-monitoring skills using textual posts on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *33*, 69–78.
Hirschmüller, S., Egloff, B., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). The dual lens model: A comprehensive framework for understanding self-other agreement of personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*(2), 335–353.
Hirschmüller, S., Egloff, B., Schmukle, S. C., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2015). Accurate judgments of neuroticism at zero acquaintance: A question of relevance. *Journal of Personality*, *83*(2), 221–228.
Hirschmüller, S., Schmukle, S. C., Krause, S., Back, M. D., & Egloff, B. (2018). Accuracy of self-esteem judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality*, *86*(2), 308–319.
Holleran, S. E., & Mehl, M. R. (2008). Let me read your mind: Personality judgments based on a person's natural stream of thought. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(3), 747–754.
Holtzman, N. S., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Sounds like a narcissist: Behavioral manifestations of narcissism in everyday life. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(4), 478–484.
Hong, C., Chen, Z. F., & Li, C. (2017). "Liking" and being "liked": How are personality traits and demographics associated with giving and receiving "likes" on Facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior*, *68*, 292–299.
Human, L. J., & Biesanz, J. C. (2013). Targeting the good target: An integrative review of the characteristics and consequences of being accurately perceived. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, *17*(3), 248–272.
Human, L. J., Biesanz, J. C., Finseth, S. M., Pierce, B., & Le, M. (2014). To thine own self be true: Psychological adjustment promotes judgeability via personality-behavior congruence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*(2), 286–303.
Jia, Y. L., & Lindell, A. K. (2016). Featural information is sufficient to produce a left cheek bias for happiness perception. *Brain and Cognition*, *107*, 10–15.
Jones, B. C., Feinberg, D. R., Debruine, L. M., Little, A. C., & Vukovic, J. (2010). A domain-specific opposite-sex bias in human preferences for manipulated voice pitch. *Animal Behaviour*, *79*(1), 57–62.
Kaye, L. K., Wall, H. J., & Malone, S. A. (2016). "Turn that frown upside-down": A contextual account of emoticon usage on different virtual platforms. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *60*, 463–467.
Kenny, D. A. (1991). A general model of consensus and accuracy in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 155–163.
Kenny, D. A. (1994). *Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
Kenny, D. A., & Albright, L. (1987). Accuracy in interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *102*(3), 390–402.
Kenny, D. A., & Winquist, L. (2001). The measurement of interpersonal sensitivity: Consideration of design, components, and unit of analysis. In J. A. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *The LEA series in personality and clinical*

psychology. Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement (pp. 265–302). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Klofstad, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Nowicki, S. (2015). Perceptions of competence, strength, and age influence voters to select leaders with lower-pitched voices. *Plos One*, *10*(8), e133779.

Klofstad, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Peters, S. (2012). Sounds like a winner: Voice pitch influences perception of leadership capacity in both men and women. *Proceedings Biological Sciences*, *279*(1738), 1–7.

Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D., & Graepel, T. (2013). Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *110*(15), 5802–5805.

Kramer, R. S. S., & Ward, R. (2011). Different signals of personality and health from the two sides of the face. *Perception*, *40*(5), 549–562.

Küfner, A. C. P., Back, M. D., Nestler, S., & Egloff, B. (2010). Tell me a story and I will tell you who you are! Lens model analyses of personality and creative writing. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(4), 427–435.

Lee, E., Ahn, J., & Kim, Y. J. (2014). Personality traits and self-presentation at Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *69*, 162–167.

Letzring, T. D. (2015). Observer judgmental accuracy of personality: Benefits related to being a good (normative) judge. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *54*, 51–60.

Letzring, T. D., & Human, L. J. (2014). An examination of information quality as a moderator of accurate personality judgment. *Journal of Personality*, *82*(5), 440–451.

Li, J., & Chignell, M. (2010). Birds of a feather: How personality influences blog writing and reading. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *68*(9), 589–602.

Liu, Y. C., Lin, C., & Huang, Y-A. (2013). An exploration of communicating with textspeak - A social presence perspective. *The International Technology Management Review*, *3*(1), 54–59.

Luhmann, M., Bohn, J., Holtmann, J., Koch, T., & Eid, M. (2016). I'm lonely, can't you tell? Convergent validity of self- and informant ratings of loneliness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *61*, 50–60.

Manson, J. H., & Robbins, M. L. (2017). New evaluation of the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR): Obtrusiveness, compliance, and participant self-selection effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 658.

Marengo, D., Giannotta, F., & Settanni, M. (2017). Assessing personality using emoji: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *112*, 74–78.

Markey, P. M., & Wells, S. M. (2002). Interpersonal perception in internet chat rooms. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*(2), 134–146.

Marshall, T. C., Lefringhausen, K., & Ferenczi, N. (2015). The Big Five, self-esteem, and narcissism as predictors of the topics people write about in Facebook status updates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *85*, 35–40.

Mayer, J. D., Phillips, K. G., & Barry, A. (2015). Getting the message: The adaptive potential of interpersonal judgments. *Review of General Psychology*, *19*(1), 39–51.

Mcaleer, P., Todorov, A., & Belin, P. (2014). How do you say 'Hello'? Personality impressions from brief novel voices. *Plos One*, *9*(3), e90779.

Mehl, M. R., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Personality in its natural habitat: Manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(5), 862–877.

Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). Applications and extensions of the lens model to understand interpersonal judgments at zero acquaintance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(5), 374–379.

Novak, P. K., Smailović, J., Sluban, B., & Mozetič, I. (2015). Sentiment of Emojis. *Plos One*, *10*(12), e144296.

Okdie, B. M., Guadagno, R. E., Bernieri, F. J., Geers, A. L., & Mclarney-Vesotski, A. R. (2011). Getting to know you: Face-to-face versus online interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *27*(1), 153–159.

Oleszkiewicz, A., Karwowski, M., Pisanski, K., Sorokowski, P., Sobrado, B., & Sorokowska, A. (2017). Who uses emoticons? Data from 86 702 Facebook users. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 289–295.

Oosterhof, N. N., & Todorov, A. (2008). The functional basis of face evaluation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *105*(32), 11087–11092.

Penton-voak, I. S., Pound, N., Little, A. C., & Perrett, D. I. (2006). Personality judgments from natural and composite facial images: More evidence for a "kernel of truth" in social perception. *Social Cognition*, *24*(5), 607–640.

Petrican, R., Todorov, A., & Grady, C. (2014). Personality at face value: Facial appearance predicts self and other personality judgments among strangers and spouses. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *38*(3), 259–277.

Puts, D. A., Gaulin, S. J. C., & Verdolini, K. (2006). Dominance and the evolution of sexual dimorphism in human voice pitch. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *27*(4), 283–296.

Qiu, L., Lu, J. H., Yang, S. S., Qu, W. N., & Zhu, T. S. (2015). What does your selfie say about you? *Computers*

in Human Behavior, *52*, 443–449.

Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2006). Message in a ballad: The role of music preferences in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Science*, *17*(3), 236–242.

Rogers, K. H., & Biesanz, J. C. (2015). Knowing versus liking: Separating normative knowledge from social desirability in first impressions of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*(6), 1105–1116.

Schneider, T. M., & Carbon, C. C. (2017). Taking the perfect selfie: Investigating the impact of perspective on the perception of higher cognitive variables. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(8), 971.

Scott, G. G., Sinclair, J., Short, E., & Bruce, G. (2014). It's not what you say, it's how you say it: Language use on Facebook impacts employability but not attractiveness. *Cyberpsychology Behavior and Social Networking*, *17*(8), 562–566.

Sorokowska, A. (2013). Seeing or smelling? Assessing personality on the basis of different stimuli. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*(2), 175–179.

Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., & Havlíček, J. (2016). Body odor based personality judgments: The effect of fragranced cosmetics. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*,530.

Stopfer, J. M., Egloff, B., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2014). Personality expression and impression formation in online social networks: An integrative approach to understanding the processes of accuracy, impression management and meta-accuracy. *European Journal of Personality*, *28*(1), 73–94.

Sutherland, C. A. M., Rowley, L. E., Amoaku, U. T., Daguzan, E., Kiddrossiter, K. A., Maceviciute, U., & Young, A. W. (2015). Personality judgments from everyday images of faces. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 1616.

Tackett, J. L., Herzhoff, K., Kushner, S. C., & Rule, N. (2016). Thin slices of child personality: Perceptual, situational, and behavioral contributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*(1), 150–166.

Teijeiro-Mosquera, L., Biel, J-I., Alba-Castro, J. L., & Gatica-Perez, D. (2015). What your face vlogs about: Expressions of emotion and Big-Five traits impressions in YouTube. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, *6*, 193–205.

Tigue, C. C., Borak, D. J., O'Connor, J. J. M., Schandl, C., & Feinberg, D. R. (2012). Voice pitch influences voting behavior. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *33*(3), 210–216.

Todorov, A., Olivola, C. Y., Dotsch, R., & Mendesiedlecki, P. (2015). Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional significance. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), 519–545.

Tsantani, M. S., Belin, P., Paterson, H. M., & Mcaleer, P. (2016). Low vocal pitch preference drives first impressions irrespective of context in male voices but not in female voices. *Perception, 45*(8), 946–963.

Tskhay, K. O., & Rule, N. O. (2014). Perceptions of personality in text-based media and OSN: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *49*, 25–30.

Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person? The Self-Other Knowledge Asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(2), 281–300.

Vazire, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2004). E-perceptions: Personality impressions based on personal websites. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(1), 123–132.

Walker, M., & Vetter, T. (2016). Changing the personality of a face: Perceived Big Two and Big Five personality factors modeled in real photographs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*(4), 609–624.

Wall, H. J., Kaye, L. K., & Malone, S. A. (2016). An exploration of psychological factors on emoticon usage and implications for judgement accuracy. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *62*, 70–78.

Wall, H. J., Taylor, P. J., Dixon, J., Conchie, S. M., & Ellis, D. A. (2013). Rich contexts do not always enrich the accuracy of personality judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*(6), 1190–1195.

Walther, J. B., & D'Addario, K. P. (2001). The impacts of emoticons on message interpretation in computer-mediated communication. *Social Science Computer Review*, *19*(3), 324–347.

Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). Self-other agreement in personality and affectivity: The role of acquaintanceship, trait visibility, and assumed similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*(3), 546–558.

Williams, E. (1977). Experimental comparisons of face-to-face and mediated communication: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*(5), 963–976.

Winter, S., Neubaum, G., Eimler, S. C., Gordon, V., Theil, J., Herrmann, J., & Krämer, N. C. (2014). Another brick in the Facebook wall – How personality traits relate to the content of status updates. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *34*, 194–202.

Yeagley, E., Morling, B., & Nelson, M. (2007). Nonverbal zero-acquaintance accuracy of self-esteem, social dominance orientation, and satisfaction with life. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(5), 1099–1106.

Youyou, W., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. (2015). Computer-based personality judgments are more accurate

than those made by humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *112*(4), 1036–1040.

Youyou, W., Stillwell, D., Schwartz, H. A., & Kosinski, M. (2017). Birds of a feather do flock together: Behavior-based personality-assessment method reveals personality similarity among couples and friends. *Psychological Science*, *28*(3), 276–284.

The validity of cues in personality judgment

WU Ting; ZHENG Yong

(*Faculty of Psychological Science, Southwest University, Chongqing* 400715, *China*)

Abstract: The lens model emphasizes that the validity of cues is important in accurate personality judgment. Existing research indicates that text messages, voice communication, face images, video clips reflecting different situations, and face-to-face communication involving many kinds of verbal and nonverbal information play an important role in the process of personality judgment. On the other hand, conventional text and video information against the background of the network can also effectively reflect an individual's personality traits. Besides, the validity of some network languages—the use of facial expressions and status updates and clicking “like,” which are closely related to personality traits—is worth further exploration. Future research should consider the cues into the real-life situation and improve the ecological validity. It is also important to consider comparison between different cues to see which kind of lead is more effective. Finally, future research should be conducted from the perspective of the validity of the individual behaviors in the network situation to try to understand the cues of personality judgment more deeply.

Key words: personality judgment; cues; validity; accuracy; network situation